

REMARKS

This Response is made in response to the final Office Action dated August 14, 2007. Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 43-49 are pending. Favorable reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 43, 44 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. (6,007,574) in view of Leone et al. (5,902,266); claims 46, 48 and 49 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. in view of Leone et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Kavteladze et al. (5,643,339); and claim 15 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulnev et al. in view of Leone et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Hyodoh et al. (2003/0040772). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the cited art does not teach the subject matter recited in the pending claims. In particular, it is submitted that the cited art does not teach a device including a tubular elongate filament configured to form a generally tubular body having first and second ends defined by a plurality of circumferentially spaced endless reversals of direction of the filament, wherein at least one of the plurality of **reversals** embody a **full-turn helical** configuration.

The Examiner has indicated that he has interpreted the limitation "a full-turn helical configuration" as being shown in Figure 1-3 and described in the specification as the fiber (1) which extends through out the circumference of the stent by helically winding the fiber around the surface of the stent. However, the Examiner has seriously misinterpreted the term "full-turn helical configuration" recited in all of the pending claims. As Applicants specifically addressed in the Amendment dated April 16, 2007, the

reversals which embody the full-turn helical configuration are depicted in FIG. 8 of the present application. In the April 16, 2007 Amendment, Applicants amended the claims to specify that at least one of the plurality of reversals embodies a "full-turn helical configuration." In the Remarks section, Applicants stated the following:

Notably, whereas certain prior art references may disclose a reversal similar to that shown in FIG. 5 of the present application, the art does not teach or contemplate the full-turn helical reversal depicted in FIG. 8 of the present application.

Applicants are puzzled as to why the Examiner interpreted this claim term in conjunction with the embodiment of FIGS. 1-3 since the structure embodying this claim term is clearly described and depicted in FIG. 8, as was pointed out by Applicants in the April 16, 2007 Amendment. Therefore, the Examiner has clearly misinterpreted this claim term which is fully disclosed and identified in the specification. None of the cited art discloses a reversal having a "full-turn helical configuration" as recited in the claims and disclosed in the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, recites subject matter which is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectively urged that all of the present claims of the application are patentable and in a condition for allowance. The undersigned attorney can be reached at (310) 824-5555 to facilitate prosecution of this application, if necessary.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to our Deposit

Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: /Thomas H. Majcher/
Thomas H. Majcher
Registration No. 31,119

THM:lm
Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201